



African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management

ajthm.eanso.org

Volume 4, Issue 1, 2025

Print ISSN: 2790-9603 | Online ISSN: 2790-9611

Title DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/2790-9611>



EAST AFRICAN
NATURE &
SCIENCE
ORGANIZATION

Original Article

Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya

Dr. Stephen Kamau Nguthi, PhD¹*

¹ Maseno University, P. O. Box 333-40105, Maseno, Kenya.

* Author for Correspondence ORCID ID; <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4783-4064>; Email: kanguthis@gmail.com

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3348>

Date Published: **ABSTRACT**

18 July 2025

Keywords:

Tourist Motivations,
Pull Motivations,
Push Motivations,
Destination Loyalty,
Destination
Competitiveness,
Destination Attributes.

This study investigated the influence of tourist motivations on destination loyalty in Kenya's Lake Victoria region, surveying 299 tourists from 26 hotels. PLS SEM was conducted to analyse the data. Findings reveal that destination core resources (DCR) influence tourists' destination loyalty (DCL), ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.47$, $p = .01$), as did destination support resources (DSR) ($\beta = .23$, $t = 2.60$, $p = .01$). However, destination qualifying & amplifying determinants (DQD) and destination management practices (DMF) did not influence destination loyalty. Further, Psychological factors (PF) significantly influence tourists' destination loyalty (DCL) ($\beta = .21$, $t = 3.07$, $p = .00$), as did green consumption factor (GCF) ($\beta = .25$, $t = 3.43$, $p = .00$). Self-development factor (SDF) and socio-cultural factor (SCF) did not influence tourists' destination loyalty (DCL). By examining the influence of tourist motivations on destination loyalty, this research helps predict tourists' travel behaviour to the destination.

APA CITATION

Nguthi, S. K. (2025). Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya. *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 4(1), 296-311. <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3348>.

CHICAGO CITATION

Nguthi, Stephen Kamau. 2025. "Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya". *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management* 4 (1), 296-311. <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3348>.

HARVARD CITATION

Nguthi, S. K. (2025) "Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya" *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 4(1), pp. 296-311. doi: 10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3348

IEEE CITATION

S. K. Nguthi "Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya", *AJTHM*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 296-311, Jul. 2025.

MLA CITATION

Nguthi, Stephen Kamau. "Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty in the Lake Victoria Tourism Circuit, Kenya". *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 4, no. 1, Jul. 2025, pp. 296-311, doi:10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3348

INTRODUCTION

Literature review indicates that understanding both pull and push motivation factors is the most appropriate way of explaining why individuals travel to particular destinations. In understanding push and pull motivations of tourists, destination managers are able to establish factors influencing individuals' travel decisions and the consequences of those decisions (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; Jang & Cai, 2002; Kim & Lee, 2002; Sirakaya, Uysal, & Yoshioka, 2003). Consequently, destination managers are able to identify the competitiveness of their destinations as indicative of destination loyalty decisions. Both pull and push motivations are conceptualised as standalone but interrelated concepts in the current study. This is because individuals are faced with both push and pull motivation forces at different stages in their decision-making process (Fluker & Turner, 2000).

By understanding pull and push motivations, destination managers are in a better position to satisfy tourists' exclusive desires and preferences, thereby enhancing destination competitiveness. Pull factors are factors contributing to the general attractiveness of a destination as perceived by the traveller. They include tangible and intangible resources of a specific destination such as beaches, sunshine, recreation facilities and historic resources. Generally, pull factors constitute the physical attributes of the destination and the intangible services drawn from using those resources, such as novelty. In this study, pull factors are postulated to have a positive influence on the attractiveness of the destination. Literature identifies push motivation factors as including; *Psychological motivations* i.e.; escape relaxation, social interaction, knowledge or entertainment as tourists' push motivation factors (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Kim, Lee, & Klenosky, 2003; Kozak, 2002; Oh, Uysal, & Weaver, 1995; Yoon & Uysal, 2005), *Social and cultural influences* i.e.; systems of values, ideas and practices in a community (Hawkins et al., 2003), *“green” consumption behavior factors* i.e., purchase

behavior with environmental consciousness (Chen & Chen, 2010; Cronin et al., 2011), *self-development factors*, i.e. developing oneself, as the main push motivation factors. The study postulates that tourists are highly motivated when destination attributes fulfil their psychological needs, social and cultural needs, as well as their “green” consumption desires. As such, this study sought to establish whether psychological needs of a tourist, their cultural needs, as well as “green” consumption needs, significantly influenced their loyalty towards the destination.

Destination Loyalty

Literature shows that loyalty has been conceptualised either as attitudinal loyalty or behavioural loyalty (Jones & Taylor, 2007; Li & Petrick, 2008). Attitudinal loyalty deals with the willingness of the consumer to make repeat purchases of the same product or service and identify with the particular product or service in the future (Atilgan et al., 2005; Russell-Bennett, McColl-Kennedy, & Coote, 2007). Thus, attitudinal loyalty implies the attitude of the consumer or traveller towards a destination as measured by their willingness to visit the destination in future and their willingness to communicate the benefits of visiting the destination to others. On the contrary, behavioural loyalty implies the willingness of the consumer to make re-purchase decisions in future as measured by their repeat buying behaviour (Pappu et al., 2005). Thus, behavioural loyalty refers to the frequency of repeat purchase or the relative volume of the same brand purchase.

Unlike in the general marketing discipline, where loyalty has been extensively researched, research on destination loyalty among tourism scholars is limited (Boo et al., 2009; Konecnik & Gartner, 2007; Pike, 2010; Qu et al., 2011). Literature further shows that destination loyalty influences tourists' behaviour during the destination choice process (Chon, 1992; Um & Crompton, 1990; Woodside & Lysons, 1989).

Several studies have confirmed that destination loyalty is the final and core factor in predicting the future travel demand by enhancing competitiveness of a particular destination as compared to destinations with similar attributes (Chen & Gursoy, 2001; Oppermann, 2000; Petrick & Backman, 2002; Petrick, Morais, & Norman, 2001; Petrick, Tonner, & Quinn, 2006; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). The implication of these studies is the ultimate need for destinations to attain and maintain loyalty from their existing clients in order to remain successful and competitive. The current study operationalises loyalty as the likelihood of revisiting the destination by the current tourists as well as their willingness to recommend the destination to other willing travellers.

In conclusion, it is evident from the literature that there is a relationship between tourists' motivations and loyalty (Baker et al., 2002; Cronin et al., 2000; Boo et al., 2009; Pike, 2010; Qu et al., 2011). However, empirical studies specifying the influence of both push and pull motivational factors (together and separately) on destination loyalty are scarce.

METHODOLOGY

Study Area

The study area was the Lake Victoria Region tourism circuit in Western Kenya, encompassing Bungoma, Busia, Homa-Bay, Kakamega, Kisii, Kisumu, Migori, Nyamira, Siaya, Kericho, Trans-Nzoia, Bomet, and Vihiga counties. This region, home to over 10 million people with diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, lies between latitudes 1°16'N and 1°54'S and longitudes 33°55' and 35°51'E. The climate is generally mild (19-25°C year-round) with a modified equatorial rainfall pattern of long rains (March-June) and short rains (September-November), averaging 700mm to 2000mm annually.

The Lake Victoria Region offers diverse tourism attractions, including freshwater resources (L. Victoria, L. Simbi Nyaima, L. Kanyaboli, L. Sare), mountains, indigenous forests, caves, national

parks, beaches, waterfalls, hot springs, islands, and cultural shrines. Despite this potential, the region's natural and cultural capital is underexploited, hindering tourism development. Inadequate branding and marketing contribute to its low visibility domestically and internationally, necessitating urgent promotional efforts.

Research Approach

This study employed a quantitative research approach, acknowledging its limitations, to investigate the influence of tourist motivations on destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region tourism circuit, Kenya.

Population and Sample

The study population comprised tourists visiting hotels and attractions in the Lake Victoria Region tourism circuit between August and October 2018 (estimated n=1317, based on Kenya Gazette, 2018). To generate representative sample sizes from the population of tourists, Creative Research Systems (2003) formula was used. Using the formula, the sample size was determined as follows:

$$SS = \frac{Z^2 \times (p) \times (1 - p)}{C^2}$$

Where:

SS = Sample Size

Z = Z-value (e.g., 1.96 for a 95 per cent confidence level)

P = Percentage of population picking a choice, expressed as a decimal (.5 used for sample size needed)

C = Confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g., .04 = +/- 4 percentage points)

$$SS = \frac{1.96^2 \times (0.5) \times (1 - 0.5)}{0.04^2}$$

$$SS = 600$$

The required sample size for an infinite population is thus 600.

Since the population of tourists by use of hotel rooms was estimated at 461, and assuming that each room is occupied by a different tourist only once throughout the data collection period, the new sample size for the study was calculated as shown below.

$$\text{New SS} = \frac{SS}{(1 + (SS - 1)/\text{pop})}$$

Where pop = finite population

$$\text{New SS} = \frac{600}{(1 + ((600 - 1)/461))}$$

New SS = 260.943396

$$\text{New SS} = 261 \text{ Tourists}$$

To obtain the actual sample size, multi-stage sampling was used. Stratified sampling and proportionate sampling were used to obtain samples whereby hotels were first stratified into geographic strata, i.e. hotels located in each of the identified counties. Stratification helped in splitting the heterogeneous population into fairly homogeneous groups so that samples could be drawn from the group with precision. Using a minimum sample size of 261, the respondents were drawn proportionately from the strata using the formula as shown below. Proportional sampling provides the researcher with a way to achieve greater representativeness in the sample of the population.

Actual Sample Size

$$= \frac{\text{Population Strata}}{\text{Estimated Study Population}} \times \text{Minimum Sample Size for the Study}$$

Where:

Population strata = 243 tourists in Uasin Gishu county hotels, 53 tourists in Kisii county hotels, 198 tourists in Kisumu county hotels, 16 in Kakamega county hotels, and 17 tourists from Elgeyo-Markwet county hotels.

Where, Estimated study population = 461; and Study sample size = 261 Simple random sampling was used to select the actual hotels from which the respondents were obtained.

Finally, convenience sampling was considered to select actual respondents for the study from the selected hotels (i.e. 299 tourists). At least 10 respondents were picked from each selected hotel, 10 being the lowest number of rooms in all the hotels sampled. Similarly, Convenience

Data Collection

Self-administered questionnaires were used for data collection. The questionnaire covered tourist motivations (push and pull) and destination loyalty. A seven-point Likert scale was used for responses, facilitating nuanced data and suitability for linear statistical analysis.

Variable Measurement

Table 1: Tourists' Push Motivation Measures

Push motivation factor	Measured Items
Psychological	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having fun 2. Experiencing something different 3. Feeling the special atmosphere of the vacation destination 4. Visiting places related to my personal interests 5. Exploring the unknown 6. Having unpredictable experiences 7. Resting and relaxing 8. Getting away from everyday physical stress/pressure 9. Viewing the scenery
Socio-cultural	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Being close to nature

Push motivation factor	Measured Items
Self-development	11. Being with others who enjoy the same things as I do
	12. Strengthening relationships with my companion(s)
	13. Strengthening relationships with my family/friend(s)
	14. Experiencing different cultures
	15. Meeting new and varied people
	16. Developing my knowledge of the area
	17. Cultural closeness with the destination's culture
	18. Meeting the locals
	19. Observing other people's way of life in the area
	20. Feeling personally safe and secure
	21. Meeting people with similar values/interests
	22. Feeling that I belong
	23. Develop my personal interests
	24. Gaining a sense of accomplishment
	25. Developing my skills and abilities
	26. Using my skills and talents
	27. Gaining a new perspective on life
	28. Feeling inner harmony/peace
	29. Understanding more about myself
	30. Being creative
Green consumption	31. Working on my personal/spiritual values
	32. Being in a place where the natural environment is protected
	33. Enjoying authentic culture
	34. Identifying with green practices
	35. Utilise the green consumption opportunities provided in the destination.
	36. To identify with the green corporate image of the destination
	37. To stay in a green hotel
	38. To be in a hotel that manages its waste
	39. To be in a hotel that uses renewable energy
	40. To identify with a destination that respects the rights of the minority
	41. To identify with a destination where the host community's values are respected

Table 2: Tourists Pull Motivation Measures

Pull Motivation factor	Measured Items
Support resource attributes	1. Gastronomy is offered in the area.
	2. Entertainment
	3. Festivals and events in the area
	4. Attractions of cultural heritage
	5. Availability of conference and business meeting facilities
	6. Sport-recreation activities available
	7. Climate of the region
	8. Availability of up-to-date audio-visual equipment
	9. Unspoiled nature
	10. Shopping opportunities
	11. Quality of hotel services
	12. The hospitality of the local people
	13. Accessibility of the destination

Pull Motivation factor	Measured Items
Qualifying and amplifying attributes	14. Local transportation quality 15. Presence of foreign/international companies 16. Cost of transport 17. Safety and security at the destination 18. Hotel prices 19. Political stability 20. Overall destination image 21. Value for money 22. Cleanliness of the destination
Core resource attributes	23. Online booking facilities are available. 24. Knowledge of foreign languages among tourism employees 25. Availability of tourism promotion materials in a foreign language 26. Education profile of employees in tourism 27. Destination reputation related to tourism 28. Development and innovations of the business tourism product 29. The available interpretation and education services at the destination 30. Human specialists for conference and business events 31. Available information linked to the tourism product offered at the destination 32. The potential for incentive trips 33. Tourism impact management and monitoring by the destination managers 34. Tourists' satisfaction management programs at the destination 35. The use of ICT by tourism firms in the region 36. Emphasis on community empowerment by the destination managers

To measure tourists' pull and push motivations, respondents were required to evaluate the relative importance of each of the items on their motivation of visit to the destination in the scale of, 1 – Not at

all important, 2 – Low importance, 3 – Slightly important, 4 – Neutral, 5 – Moderately important, 6 – Very important and 7 – Extremely important.

Table 3: Tourists' Destination Loyalty Measures

Destination Loyalty Measure	Measured Item
Attitudinal measures	1. I intend to visit this destination in the future. 2. This destination would be my preferred choice for a vacation.
Behavioral measures	3. I would advise other people to visit this destination. 4. I will tell other people about the benefits of visiting this destination.

To assess the level of tourists' destination loyalty, respondents were asked to rate on a scale of 1 – 7 (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Somewhat Disagree, 4-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5-Somewhat Agree, 6- Agree, and 7-Strongly Agree),

their extent of agreement with four items regarding their future relation with the destination.

Data Analysis

PLS-SEM was conducted in SmartPLS software version 3.2.7. Latent variables were created for destination loyalty. Tourist motivation factors were identified in PAF and used as latent variables. Measurement models were assessed for internal consistency, convergent validity, discriminant validity and collinearity. The results are as provided below.

Measurement Models Assessment

The measurement models' assessment results for internal consistency and convergent validity are presented in Table 4, while the results of discriminant validity are presented in Table 5. Table 6 presents results for collinearity assessment.

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alpha (α), composite reliability coefficients (P_c) and rho A coefficient as defined in Dijkstra and Henseler (2015) were used to assess the model's internal consistency. Values above .70 indicate higher levels of internal consistency (Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2014; Dijkstra & Henseler, 2015; Hair et al., 2017). The results in Table 4 indicate that the measures were robust in terms of their internal consistency reliability as indexed by the composite reliability (P_c). Table 4 shows that the composite reliabilities (P_c), for instance, ranged from .89

(Destination support resources) to .95 (Self-development factor). This is an indication of internal consistency and that all constructs are within accepted limits and hence reliable.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was assessed using the outer loadings $> .70$ and the Fornell and Larcker criterion, average variance extracted (AVE) $> .50$. Table 4 shows that all the outer loadings were above .70 with exception of "I would advise other people to visit this destination" under destination loyalty construct (.68). Since removing this item had no significant influence on the model, it was retained. The highest loading of 0.91 was, however, recorded between two items under the self-development factor, "Develop my personal interests" and "Developing my skills and abilities". This implies that almost all the constructs explained more than 50% of their indicators' variance. Consistent with the guidelines of Fornell and Larcker, the average variance extracted (AVE) for each measure exceeded .50. The table indicates that AVEs for this study ranged from .54 (Destination loyalty [DCL]) to .70 (Self-development factor [SDF]), implying that, on average, each construct explains more than half of the variance of its indicators.

Reliability and Convergent Validity

Table 4: Reliability and Convergent Validity Results

Constructs and measured variables	Load	α	rho_A	P_c	AVE
<i>Destination Support Resources</i>		0.89	0.89	0.89	0.67
Accessibility of the destination	0.80				
Presence of foreign/international companies	0.80				
The hospitality of the local people	0.81				
Local transportation quality	0.86				
<i>Destination Awareness</i>		0.91	0.91	0.91	0.60
The destination has a good name and reputation	0.73				
I have seen a lot of advertising promoting tourism in the Lake Victoria Region circuit	0.75				
Whenever I think of a tourism holiday in Kenya, this destination comes into mind immediately	0.80				
The destination is well-positioned in the media	0.71				
The online presence of the destination is high	0.85				

Constructs and measured variables	Load	α	rho_A	Pc	AVE
The characteristics of this destination come into mind very quickly	0.82	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.54
The destination is very famous	0.74				
<i>Destination Loyalty</i>					
I would advise other people to visit this destination	0.68				
I intend to visit this destination in the future	0.72				
I will tell other people about the benefits of visiting this destination	0.78	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.58
This destination would be my preferred choice for a vacation	0.76				
<i>Destination Core Resources</i>					
Availability of up-to-date audio-visual equipment	0.77				
Climate of the region	0.78				
Availability of conference and business meeting facilities	0.75				
Attractions of cultural heritage	0.74				
Festivals and events in the area	0.70				
Gastronomy is offered in the area	0.81				
Unspoiled nature in the destination	0.80				
Quality of hotel services in the area	0.77				
Shopping opportunities available	0.71				
<i>Destination Image</i>					
My colleagues would think highly of me if I visited this destination for tourism purposes	0.76				
Visiting this destination reflects who I am	0.72				
The destination has many interesting places	0.78				
The destination is not crowded	0.78				
In the destination, there is a variety of things to see/do	0.74	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.57
<i>Destination Management Factor</i>					
Destination reputation related to tourism	0.72				
Education profile of employees in tourism	0.72				
Knowledge of foreign languages among tourism employees	0.73				
Tourism impact management and monitoring by the destination managers	0.77				
The potential for incentive trips	0.82				
Available information linked to the tourism product offered at the destination	0.74				
The available interpretation and education services at the destination	0.73				
Development and innovations of the business tourism product	0.82				
Availability of tourism promotion materials in a foreign language	0.73				
Tourists' satisfaction management programs at the destination	0.79				
<i>Destination Perceived Quality</i>					
The destination is better compared to similar destinations in Kenya	0.82				
The level of cleanliness in the destination is high	0.74				
The quality of infrastructure in the destination is high	0.83				
Tourism infrastructure in the destination is reliable	0.79				

Constructs and measured variables	Load	α	rho_A	Pc	AVE
There are high levels of personal safety in the destination	0.77	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.63
Accommodation in this destination is of high quality	0.74				
<i>Destination Perceived Value</i>					
The price of accommodation is affordable	0.77				
The destination provides opportunities to enjoy authentic culture	0.82				
The destination provides opportunities for the feeling of belongingness	0.78				
The destination provides more benefits than other similar destinations in Kenya	0.79				
The price for accommodation and services is competitive as compared to other destinations for me	0.73				
The destination provides opportunities to experience other cultures	0.87				
Visiting this destination provides an opportunity to have fun compared to similar destinations	0.77				
The destination provides an opportunity to stay in a green hotel	0.79	0.92	0.93	0.92	0.60
The destination provides opportunities to be close to nature	0.83				
<i>Destination Qualifying Determinants</i>					
Cleanliness of the destination	0.72				
Overall destination image	0.88				
Hotel prices	0.78				
Value for money	0.76				
Online booking facilities are available	0.74				
Political stability in the area	0.76				
Safety and security at the destination	0.75				
Cost of transport to the destination	0.80				
<i>Green Consumption Factor</i>		0.90	0.91	0.90	0.61
Enjoying authentic culture	0.79				
Utilise the green consumption opportunities provided in the destination	0.85				
To stay in a green hotel	0.72				
Identifying with green practices	0.78				
To identify with the green corporate image of the destination	0.78				
To identify with a destination where the host community's values are respected	0.75				
<i>Psychological Factors</i>					
Getting away from everyday physical stress/pressure	0.72				
Being close to nature	0.81				
Experiencing something different	0.84	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.63
Having fun	0.85				
Visiting places related to my personal interests	0.74				
Feeling the special atmosphere of the vacation destination	0.80				
Having unpredictable experiences	0.83				
Exploring the unknown	0.77				
<i>Self-Development Factor</i>					
Gaining a sense of accomplishment	0.90				
Being creative	0.78				

Constructs and measured variables	Load	α	rho_A	Pc	AVE
Feeling inner harmony/peace	0.86				
Gaining a new perspective on life	0.84				
Understanding more about myself	0.75				
Develop my personal interests	0.91				
Developing my skills and abilities	0.91				
Using my skills and talents	0.82				
Working on my personal/spiritual values	0.74				
<i>Social Cultural Factor</i>		0.93	0.93	0.94	0.55
Enhance my knowledge of the area	0.74				
Enhance the feeling of belongingness	0.73				
Enhance my relationship with my companion	0.78				
Being close to a culture similar to my culture	0.75				
Experiencing a different culture	0.73				
Enhancing my relationship with my family	0.76				
Meeting the local community members	0.73				
Meeting new people	0.76				

Note: Load – Loadings, α - Cronbach's alpha, Pc - Composite Reliability, AVE - Average Variance Extracted, rho_A - coefficient Dijkstra-Henseler.

Discriminant Validity

This study employed the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) in assessing discriminant validity. Specifically, this study used the conservative heterotrait-monotrait ratio of HTMT_{.85}. Table 5 provides the HTMT results with values ranging between .33 in respect to HTMT (Social cultural

factor [SCF], Destination core resources [DCR]) and .69 in respect to HTMT (Destination loyalty [DCL], Destination awareness [DA]).

Comparing these results with the threshold values as defined in HTMT_{.85} (Henseler, Ringle et al., 2014) does not give rise to a discriminant validity concern.

Table 5: Discriminant Validity (Heterotrait-monotrait ratio [HTMT_{.85}] Criterion) Results

	DSR	DA	DCL	DCR	DI	DMF	DPQ	DPV	DQD	GCF	PF	SDF	SCF
DSR													
DA	0.53												
DCL	0.63	0.69											
DCR	0.57	0.43	0.47										
DI	0.64	0.48	0.66	0.61									
DMF	0.56	0.84	0.67	0.52	0.50								
DPQ	0.52	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.32	0.47							
DPV	0.65	0.49	0.64	0.65	0.61	0.42	0.42						
DQD	0.63	0.35	0.54	0.62	0.59	0.41	0.34	0.67					
GCF	0.57	0.77	0.47	0.36	0.52	0.54	0.44	0.49	0.38				
PF	0.55	0.42	0.58	0.59	0.51	0.43	0.33	0.67	0.63	0.49			
SDF	0.53	0.40	0.50	0.44	0.46	0.37	0.26	0.61	0.54	0.55	0.65		
SCF	0.46	0.47	0.40	0.33	0.43	0.42	0.38	0.50	0.38	0.59	0.53	0.54	

Note: DSR - Destination Support Resources, DA - Destination Awareness, DCL - Destination Loyalty, DCR - Destination Core Resources, DI - Destination Image, DMF - Destination Management Factor, DPQ - Destination Perceived Quality, DPV - Destination Perceived Value, DQD - Destination Qualifying Determinants, GCF - Green Consumption Factor, PF - Psychological Factors, SDF - Self-Development Factor, SCF – Socio-Cultural Factors

Structural Models

Collinearity Assessment

Multi-collinearity issue in the study was assessed using the variance inflation factor (VIF) in SmartPLS 3.2.7, where a VIF value ≥ 5 indicated a potential collinearity problem (Hair et al., 2011; Hair et al., 2013; Hair et al., 2014; Petter, Straub & Rai, 2007). Table 6 shows the result of collinearity assessment among the study constructs as indexed by the variance inflation factor (VIF) values. All the VIF were < 5 , suggesting that multi-collinearity was not an issue.

The highest VIF value (2.96) is registered between Green consumption factor (GCF) and Destination loyalty (DCL), while the lowest VIF value of 1.41 is recorded between Destination management factor (DMF) and Destination awareness (DA), and Green consumption factor (GCF) and Destination awareness (DA).

Tests for research hypotheses were conducted using bootstrapping in SmartPLS 3.4.7, and the results are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: Direct Hypotheses Testing and Variance Accounted for (VIF) Results

Paths	β	Mean	SD	T Statistics	P Values	VIF	Sig. Level	Conclusion
Destination Support Resources -> Destination Loyalty	0.23	0.23	0.09	2.60	0.01	1.91	***	H ₂ accepted
Destination Core Resources -> Destination Loyalty	0.20	0.20	0.08	2.47	0.01	1.73	***	H ₁ accepted
Destination Management Factor -> Destination Loyalty	0.15	0.14	0.08	1.92	0.06	1.46	NS	H ₄ rejected
Destination Qualifying Determinants -> Destination Loyalty	0.11	0.11	0.09	1.19	0.24	2.05	NS	H ₃ rejected
Green Consumption Factor -> Destination Loyalty	0.25	0.25	0.07	3.43	0.00	2.96	****	H ₇ accepted
Psychological Factors -> Destination Loyalty	0.21	0.21	0.07	3.07	0.00	2.12	****	H ₅ accepted
Self-Development Factor -> Destination Loyalty	0.09	0.10	0.09	1.09	0.28	1.99	NS	H ₆ rejected
Social Cultural Factor -> Destination Loyalty	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.57	0.57	1.89	NS	H ₈ rejected

Note: β – beta coefficient, SD – Standard Deviation; Sig. – Significance level; NS – Not significant

** $p \leq .05$. *** $p \leq .01$. **** $p \leq .001$.

Structural Model Path Coefficients and Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Table 7 shows that the R^2 value for the endogenous constructs is above the 25% accepted level set as the threshold in this study.

Table 7: Determinant of Coefficients (R^2) Results for the Endogenous Constructs

	R Square	R Square Adjusted	Cut Off	Description
Destination Awareness	0.85	0.84	>.25	Substantial
Destination Loyalty	0.76	0.76	>.25	Substantial
Destination Image	0.55	0.54	>.25	Moderate
Destination Perceived Quality	0.34	0.33	>.25	Moderate
Destination Perceived Value	0.64	0.64	>.25	Substantial

Note N/A – Not applicable

Influence of Tourists' Motivation Factors and Perceptions on Destination Loyalty

This study sought to determine whether tourists' motivation factors influenced destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region tourism circuit, Kenya. To actualise the objective, the following hypotheses were tested:

H₁: Destination core resources significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₂: Destination support resources significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₃: Destination qualifying and amplifying resources significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₄: Destination management practices significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₅: Tourists' Psychological factors significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₆: Tourists' Self-Development factors significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₇: Tourists' Green-consumption factors significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

H₈: Tourists' Socio-cultural factors significantly determine tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Influence of Tourists' Push Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty

The results (see Table 6) indicate that destination core resources factor (DCR) significantly influences tourists' destination loyalty (DCL) in the Lake Victoria Region tourist circuit, Kenya ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.47$, $p = .01$), as did destination support resources (DSR) ($\beta = .23$, $t = 2.60$, $p = .01$). However, Destination qualifying and amplifying determinants (DQD) did not significantly influence tourists' destination loyalty (DCL) in the Lake Victoria Regions' Tourism Circuit ($\beta = .11$, $t = 1.19$, $p = .24$) same for Destination management practices (DMF) ($\beta = .15$, $t = 1.92$, $p = .06$). This means that of the 76% of the variance in destination loyalty (DCL) (see Table 7), Destination support resources (DSR) explain for the largest variance in comparison to destination core resources (DCR). This support (Chugh, 2018; Fathabadi et al., 2017; Tanford & Jung, 2017; Vengesai & Reisinger, 2013), whose study findings confirmed that destination support resources significantly predicted destination

loyalty. This can be explained by the fact that destination support resources such as climate, shopping opportunities, gastronomy offered in the area, quality of hotel services, conference and business meeting facilities, will not only attract tourists to the destination but will determine their level of satisfaction, thereby influencing their revisit decisions. As a basic undertaking, tourism destination managers should understand the fundamental reasons why people travel and match the destination offerings with the needs of the travellers (Bieger & Laesser, 2002; Cha, McCleary, & Uysal, 1995; Crompton, 1979; Kozak, 2002; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991).

Influence of Tourists' Push Motivation Factors on Destination Loyalty

Table 6 shows that Psychological factors (PF) significantly influences tourists' destination loyalty in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit, Kenya (DCL) ($\beta = .21$, $t = 3.07$, $p = .00$), as did Green consumption factor (GCF) ($\beta = .25$, $t = 3.43$, $p = .00$). However, Self-development factor (SDF) did not significantly influence tourists' destination loyalty (DCL) in the Lake Victoria Region Tourism Circuit Kenya ($\beta = .09$, $t = 1.09$, $p = .28$), same for Socio-cultural factor (SCF) ($\beta = .04$, $t = 0.57$, $p = .57$). This means that of the 76% of the variance in destination loyalty (DCL) (see Table 7), Green consumption factors (GCF) explain for the largest variance in comparison to Psychological factors (PF). In this regards, green consumption desires such as, to stay in a green hotel, to identify with green corporate image, to be in a hotel that has a waste management programme, to be in a hotel that uses renewable energy, to enjoy authentic culture and to be in a destination that upholds the values of the host community while respecting the rights of the minority, would largely determine destination loyalty. This is in line with the findings of (Kladou et al., 2017; Lin & Hsu, 2015; Zare, 2019) that within the larger consumer market, there is a segment of environmentally sensitive clients whose product choice decision is based on how the product relates to the environment. The findings also corroborate with Yüzbaşıoğlu et al.,

(2014) findings that green hotels have a competitive advantage over the rest and have a positive impact on destination sustainability. This generally points to the significance of environmental consciousness in determining tourists' destination loyalty.

CONCLUSIONS

This study is a confirmation of the critical role played by both push and pull factors in tourists' destination loyalty decision-making process. The study findings therefore superimpose the need for destination managers to correctly match push and pull motivation factors with the travellers' desires. This study affirms that destination choice decisions and behaviour towards the destination are determined by the existing push and pull motivation factors. Thus, it is prudent that researchers acknowledge the even though push and pull motivation factors are conceptualised as distinct items, they operate in a simultaneous manner whereby tourists are pushed by internal factors and then pulled or drawn by some external factors towards a particular destination. Tourists' needs are unlimited, thus, developing a deeper understanding of both push and pull travel motivation has a likelihood of enabling destination managers and tourism service providers to satisfy the diverse and unique needs of the travellers, thereby enhancing destination competitiveness.

Specifically, the study highlights critical information about the influence of motivation factors on destination loyalty. The study suggests that destination core resources, destination support resources, Psychological factors, as well as green consumption factors, significantly influence destination loyalty. Therefore, to gain destination loyalty, destination managers are required to maximise the provision of the destination's core and support resources, while at the same time offering a tourism product that satisfies the psychological and green consumption desires of the traveller.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atilgan, Y., Aksoy, S., & Akinci, S. (2005). Determinants of brand equity: A cross-national application. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 22(2), 128-139.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 868-897.
- Baloglu, S., & Uysal, M. (1996). Market segmentation² of potential visitors by purpose of trip. *Tourism Management*, 17(7), 487-496.
- Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2002). Market segmentation by motivation: The case of Swiss holiday tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 68-76.
- Boo, S., Kim, H., & Uk Kim, H. (2009). Determinants of destination brand equity. *International Marketing Review*, 26(1), 20-34.
- Cha, S., McCleary, K. W., & Uysal, M. (1995). Travel motivations of Japanese overseas travelers: A factor-cluster segmentation approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), 33-39.
- Chen, C. F., & Chen, S. C. (2010). The impact of green perceived value, green satisfaction and green trust on green purchase intentions: The mediation effects of green brand equity. *Journal of Brand Management*, 18(1), 4-19.
- Chen, C. F., & Gursoy, D. (2001). An investigation of the intent to purchase organic food by generational cohort. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 401-413.
- Chin, W. W. (2010). How to write up the results of a PLS-SEM analysis. In V. Esposito Vinzi, W. W. Chin, J. Henseler, & H. Wang (Eds.), *Handbook of partial least squares: Concepts, methods and applications* (pp. 655-690). Springer.
- Chon, K. S. (1992). The role of destination image in tourism choice: A review. *Tourism Management*, 13(1), 23-29.
- Chugh, S. (2018). Tourist destination competitiveness: Role of destination support and experiential resources. *Tourism Review*, 73(1), 101-117.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Cronin Jr, J. J., Smith, J. S., Gleim, M. R., Ramirez, E., & Martinez, D. (2011). Green marketing myopia: A cause for concern. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-154.
- Dijkstra, T. K., & Henseler, J. (2015). Consistent partial least squares path modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 39(2), 297-316.
- Fathabadi, S. J., Tanhaei, H. A., & Ghorbanzadeh, P. (2017). The impact of tourism support resources on destination image and tourists' satisfaction. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 24, 130-136.
- Fluker, M., & Turner, L. W. (2000). Needs, motivations, and travel behavior: A conceptual discussion. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 9(4), 1-24.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2011). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publications.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46(1-2), 1-12.

- Hawkins, D. E., Shafer, E. L., & Rovelstad, G. (2003). *Tourism in the modern world*. Thomson Learning.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115-135.
- Jang, S. S., & Cai, L. A. (2002). Travel motivations and the roles of information sources and travel constraints: The case of senior travelers. *Tourism Management*, 23(6), 581-592.
- Jones, M. A., & Taylor, S. F. (2007). The conceptual domain of service loyalty: How many dimensions? *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21(1), 36-51.
- Kim, H., & Lee, T. J. (2002). Push and pull motivation in rural tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(3), 237-255.
- Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K., & Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at multi-day festivals. *Tourism Management*, 24(5), 505-514.
- Kladou, S., Kavaratzis, M., Rigopoulou, I., & Salonika, E. (2017). The role of destination image in building competitive advantage. *Tourism Management*, 60, 272-281.
- Konecnik, M., & Gartner, W. C. (2007). Customer-based brand equity for a destination. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 400-421.
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations across nine European countries. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 553-560.
- Li, X. R., & Petrick, J. F. (2008). Examining the determinants of destination loyalty: A structural modeling approach. *Tourism Analysis*, 13(4), 429-444.
- Lin, C. H., & Hsu, Y. Y. (2015). The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand equity and purchase intention: A perspective of consumers' perceived value. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 45-57.
- Mannell, R. C., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1987). Psychological and social constraints on leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19(1), 3-11.
- Oh, H. C., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P. (1995). Product bundles and perceived travel value. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(3), 464-477.
- Oppermann, M. (2000). Destination equity and its determinants. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 97-100.
- Pappu, R., Quester, P. G., & Cooksey, R. W. (2005). Consumer-based brand equity: Comparing multiple market segments based on demographic and product-related characteristics. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(7), 414-421.
- Petrick, J. F., & Backman, S. J. (2002). An examination of the construct of perceived value for the prediction of golfers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 38-45.
- Petrick, J. F., Morais, D. B., & Norman, W. C. (2001). The influence of involvement, travel benefits, and commitment on destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 39-48.
- Petrick, J. F., Tonner, C., & Quinn, B. (2006). The utilization of perceived value to examine golf travelers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(3), 382-402.
- Petter, S., Straub, D., & Rai, A. (2007). Specifying formative constructs in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(4), 623-656.
- Pike, S. (2010). Destination brand positions of 16 European cities. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 1(1-2), 3-12.
- Qu, H., Kim, L. H., & Im, H. (2011). A model of destination branding: Integrating the concepts of the branding and destination image. *Tourism Management*, 32(3), 465-476.

- Ross, G. F., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 226-237.
- Russell-Bennett, R., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Coote, L. V. (2007). Involvement, satisfaction, and brand loyalty in a small business services setting. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45(4), 531-549.
- Sirakaya, E., Uysal, M., & Yoshioka, C. F. (2003). Segmenting the international pleasure travel market by benefit sought. *Tourism Management*, 24(6), 747-756.
- Tanford, S., & Jung, S. (2017). Festival attributes, perceived quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions: A study of a Korean food festival. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 60, 127-136.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 432-448.
- Vengesai, S., & Reisinger, Y. (2013). Antecedents of tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: A structural equation modelling approach. *Tourism Analysis*, 18(1), 97-110.
- Woodside, A. G., & Lysonski, S. (1989). A general model of traveler destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(4), 8-14.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56.
- Yüzbaşıoğlu, N., Yetkin Özdemir, G., & Balık, M. (2014). Green hotel practices and environmental performance: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 140-147.
- Zare, S. (2019). The impact of green marketing on customer satisfaction and loyalty in hotel industry. *Journal of Tourism and Services Research*, 15(1), 71-85.